

2005-2006 SES EVALUATION REPORT

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

PROVIDER NAME: [Tools of Empowerment](#)

DISTRICTS SERVED: Indianapolis Public Schools

OF STUDENTS SERVED: 264 (Reading); 245 (Math)
OF STUDENTS COMPLETED: 198 (Reading); 179 (Math)

GRADES: K-12

TYPE OF DELIVERY: Small group instruction

DESCRIPTION: See <http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/dg/ses/detail-vendor2.cfm?recordID=0061>

STUDENT/TEACHER RATIO: 4-7/1

CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

PARENT REPORT

% of parents reporting: 11.11%

Overall score: 3.53/4.0

DISTRICT REPORT

% of districts served reporting: 100% (1/1)

District recommends continuation?: Y (1/1 districts served)

PRINCIPAL REPORT

% of principals reporting: 28.57%

Overall Score: 2.50/4.0

CUSTOMER SATISFACTION GRADE: **B+**

SERVICE DELIVERY

PARENT REPORT

% of parents reporting: 11.11%

Overall score: 3.32/4.0

DISTRICT REPORT:

% of districts reporting:	100% (1/1)
Overall score:	100% (18/18 possible points)

PRINCIPAL REPORT:

% of principals reporting:	28.57%
Overall score:	2.88/4.0

ONSITE MONITORING/COMPLIANCE:	3.33/4.0
--------------------------------------	----------

SERVICE DELIVERY GRADE:	B+
--------------------------------	-----------

ACADEMIC EFFECTIVENESS

COMPLETION RATE:	74.07%
-------------------------	--------

% OF STUDENTS MEETING GOALS (OF THOSE WHO COMPLETED):	93.43% (Reading) 96.09% (Math)
--	-----------------------------------

TYPE OF ASSESSMENT USED BY PROVIDER:	Grade Placement/Reading Readiness/Key Math
---	--

% OF STUDENTS SHOWING GAINS (BASED ON 100% SAMPLE REPORTED):	87.88% (Reading); 93.30% (Math);
---	----------------------------------

AVERAGE GAIN:	+8.15% (Reading—Grade Placement); +16.16% (Reading-Reading Readiness); +11.83% (Math)
----------------------	--

% CHANGE IN PRE/POST ASSESSMENT:	+16.33% (Grade Placement); +23.42% (Reading Readiness); +22.74% (Math)
---	---

% OF STUDENTS WHO ATTENDED 80% OR MORE SESSIONS:	100%
---	------

ISTEP+ DATA (included in academic effectiveness grade):

For each provider, the ISTEP+ scale scores for each student who participated in SES were analyzed for 2005 and 2006 in English/Language Arts and Math. Only students who completed 80% of their programs and had ISTEP+ scores for both years were included in the analysis.

# OF STUDENTS COMPLETING 80% OR MORE SESSIONS: (only students completing 80% of provider sessions are included in this analysis)	308
--	-----

SES STUDENTS ONLY: ISTEP+ RESULTS

For the students served by Tools of Empowerment in 2005-2006 who met the criteria described above, ISTEP+ scores grew an average of 17 points for Mathematics and 15 points for English/Language Arts. 62% showed any growth in Mathematics, and 67% showed any growth in English/Language Arts. 38% of the students showed one year's worth of growth on ISTEP+ scale score for both Mathematics, and 45% showed such growth in English/Language Arts. The percentage of students passing ISTEP+ in Mathematics declined by 14 percentage points, while the percentage passing ISTEP+ in English/Language Arts declined by 12 percentage points.

OF STUDENTS:

106

(of students completing 80% of the sessions, only those having ISTEP+ scores for both 2005 and 2006 were included in this analysis)

CHANGE:

+17.4 (Math)

+15.1 (E/LA)

% SHOWING GROWTH ON ISTEP+ SCALE SCORE:

62% (Math)

67% (E/LA)

% SHOWING 1 YEAR'S GROWTH ON ISTEP+ SCALE SCORE:

38% (Math)

45% (E/LA)

% PASSING ISTEP+ (2005):

58% (Math)

50% (E/LA)

% PASSING ISTEP+ (2006):

44% (Math)

38% (E/LA)

SES AND NON-SES STUDENTS MATCHED: ISTEP+ RESULTS

MATHEMATICS

Where possible, each student who participated in SES was matched with a similar student who did not participate in SES. SES students were matched with other students from their school on a number of characteristics, including grade in school, race, free/reduced lunch eligibility, special education status, limited English proficiency, and 2005 ISTEP+ scale score. The chart below provides the results of the match comparison that demonstrates how the ISTEP+ scores and scale score growth of students who participated in SES compare to similar students who did not participate in SES. For Tools of Empowerment, 46 matches out of 106 eligible students (43%) were found for Mathematics. For the group who participated in SES, 65% showed growth on ISTEP+, compared to 85% of the non-participating students. 35% of both groups SES showed one year's growth on ISTEP+. The SES group's average ISTEP+ score grew by 23 points, while the non-participating matched group's average ISTEP+ score grew by 25 points.

MATHEMATICS						
	# Matched	% Matched	% showing growth	% showing 1 year's growth	Average growth	% passing (2006)
SES	46	43.4%	65%	35%	23	50%
Not SES	46	43.4%	85%	35%	25	48%

ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS

Where possible, each student who participated in SES was matched with a similar student who did not participate in SES. SES students were matched with other students from their school on a number of characteristics, including grade in school, race, free/reduced lunch eligibility, special education status, limited English proficiency, and 2005 ISTEP+ scale score. The chart below provides the results of the match comparison that demonstrates how the ISTEP+ scores and scale score growth of students who participated in SES compare to similar students who did not participate in SES. For Tools of Empowerment, 46 matches out of 106 eligible students (43%) were found for English/Language Arts. For the group who participated in SES, 60% showed any growth on ISTEP+; a higher percentage of the group that did not participate in SES (62%) showed any growth. However, 40% of the students who participated in SES showed one year's growth on ISTEP+, compared to 36% of the students who did not participate in SES. The SES group's average ISTEP+ score grew by 11 points, while the non-participating matched group's average ISTEP+ score grew by 5 points.

ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS						
	# Matched	% Matched	% showing growth	% showing 1 year's growth	Average growth	% passing (2006)
SES	46	43.4%	60%	40%	11	41%
Not SES	46	43.4%	62%	36%	5	40%

ACADEMIC EFFECTIVENESS GRADE:

B

OVERALL GRADE: B+